Reliability of four different computerized cephalometric analysis programs
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SUMMARY The aim of this investigation was to compare the traditional method of manual cephalometric tracing with four different computerized tracing programs, where the lateral cephalograms were scanned at 300 dpi and digitized onscreen. Thirty randomly selected cephalometric radiographs were used in this study. Four programs Dolphin Imaging, Vistadent, Nemoceph, and Quick Ceph were evaluated. Three dental, 11 skeletal, and 1 soft tissue parameters were measured that consisted of 5 linear and 10 angular measurements. Statistical analysis was carried out using multivariate analysis of variance and Box’s and Levene’s tests.

No statistically significant difference was found between manual tracing and the computerized tracing programs. The measurements obtained with the cephalometric analysis programs used in the study were reliable.

Introduction

Cephalometric analysis has been used in orthodontic diagnosis, treatment planning, evaluation of treatment results, and prediction of growth, since its introduction by Broadbent (1931). Traditional cephalometric analysis is performed by identifying radiographic landmarks on acetate overlays and measuring the linear and angular values with a protractor and ruler. The advances in the field of computer science have led to the widespread use of computers in orthodontic cephalometry.

The sources of error in conventional cephalometric analysis include radiographic film magnification, tracing, measuring, recording, and landmark identification (Baumrind et al., 1971; Cohen and Linney, 1986; Houston et al., 1986). Conventional cephalometric analysis can be time consuming and there is a risk of misreading the measurements obtained manually. On the other hand, computer-assisted cephalometric analysis reduces the time needed for data acquisition and analysis. Computer-assisted cephalometric tracing requires the acquisition of a digital lateral skull radiographic image. The image is then transferred to a program that identifies digitized points and performs the cephalometric analysis (Sandler, 1988; Chen et al., 2000, 2004a).

In computer-assisted cephalometric analysis, angles and distances are automatically calculated that can eliminate errors in drawing lines between landmarks and in measurements with a protractor. Moreover, the digital image can be manipulated to process the image and alter its visual appearance that can facilitate landmark identification (Jackson et al., 1985). Earlier studies revealed that computer-aided cephalometric analysis does not introduce more measurement error than hand tracing, as long as landmarks are identified manually (Gravely and Benzies, 1974; Enlow and Hans, 1996).

The aim of this investigation was to compare the traditional method of manual cephalometric analysis with four different computerized cephalometric analysis programs.

Materials and methods

Thirty cephalometric radiographs randomly selected from the archives of the Department of Orthodontics, Gulhane Military Medical Academy, Haydarpasa Research and Training Hospital, were used in this study. The cephalometric radiographs were scanned into digital format at 300 dpi using an Epson Expression 1680 Professional transparency scanner (Epson USA, Long Beach, California, USA) and displayed on a 15 inch 1024 × 768 high-pixel resolution monitor. All the scanned images were then processed by the same examiner (HGG) using Dolphin Imaging Version 10.5 (Dolphin Imaging, Chatsworth, California, USA), Nemoceph NX 2006 (Nemotec, Madrid, Spain), Vistadent AT 3.1 (GAC International, Bohemia, New York, USA), and Quick Ceph 2000 (Quick Ceph Systems, San Diego, California, USA) cephalometric analysis programs. Three dental, 11 skeletal, and 1 soft tissue parameters were measured that consisted of 5 linear and 10 angular measurements (Figure 1). The same radiographs were then traced by the same examiner with a 0.3 mm 2H pencil on matte acetate paper and measured using a ruler and...
RELIABILITY OF COMPUTERIZED CEPHALOMETRY

The cephalometric analysis methods were evaluated using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Box’s and Levene’s tests were used to evaluate the compliance of the MANOVA. Pairwise comparison of estimated marginal means was used to compare the mean values for dependent variables of each cephalometric analysis program and the traditional method.

Results

No statistically significant difference was found between the various methods based on the sum of the dependent variables for each method \( (P > 0.05) \).

Even though there was no statistically significant difference between the results for the different cephalometric analysis methods, those obtained from the cephalometric analysis programs were compared with those obtained from the traditional method using pairwise comparison of estimated marginal means (Table 1).

The sum of the differences in angles and length between the traditional method and cephalometric analysis programs are shown in Figures 2a, 2b, and 3. It can be seen that the difference was small. However, when compared with the traditional method, the largest difference was found for Vistadent and the smallest for Dolphin.

Discussion

Previous studies comparing digital and manual cephalometric analysis methods revealed that computer-assisted cephalometric analysis yielded comparable results to the manual method (Sandler, 1988; Santoro et al., 2006). Moreover, computer-assisted cephalometric analysis was found to be time saving and more precise because once the landmarks are selected on the digital images and identified, the data processing can be executed and completed immediately, while there are some limitations in measuring a distance or angle with the naked eye with a ruler and protractor. With digital cephalograms obtained by various digitization processes or digital radiography, the clinician needs only to identify the landmarks and let the program calculate the cephalometric measurements (Chen et al., 2004a).

Errors with the traditional method arise from radiographic acquisition, landmark identification, measurement, and observer experience (Björk and Solow, 1962; Houston et al., 1986; Forsyth et al., 1996a,b). A previous study revealed that computer-aided cephalometric analysis does not introduce more measurement errors when localization of the landmarks is determined by hand (Gravely and Benzies, 1974). A more recent study concluded that the differences between all skeletal and dental measurements derived from the landmarks on original cephalometric radiographs and those identified on their digitized counterparts were statistically significant but clinically...
Table 1  The mean difference (M) and standard deviation (SD) of the pairwise comparison based on estimated marginal means of dependent variables from cephalometric analysis programs and those from the traditional method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dolphin</th>
<th>Nemoceph</th>
<th>Vistadent</th>
<th>Quick Ceph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean D</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN–palatal plane (°)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle angle (°)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNα (°)</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower lip–E plane (°)</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNB (°)</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-3.32</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial depth (°)</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-2.88</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convexity angle (°)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-2.43</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANB (°)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1–L1 (°)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-6.77</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillary depth (°)</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1–NB (°)</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-4.16</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N–ANS (°)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANS–Me (°)</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>-3.96</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N–Me (°)</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>-8.05</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1–palatal plane (°)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-4.22</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean difference (M) and standard deviation (SD) of the pairwise comparison based on estimated marginal means of dependent variables from cephalometric analysis programs and those from the traditional method.
by Houston (1983). Operator stress in conducting the cephalograms was controlled by undertaking five manual and five computerized tracings each day.

Sayinsu et al. (2007) found a difference between traditional and computerized methods for the measurements; maxillary height, maxillary depth, $\gamma$-axis, FMA, nasolabial angle, and the distance $N$ perpendicular. In another study, the measurement differences of 23 out of a total of 26 cephalometric variables were found to be statistically insignificant between manual measurements and those measured with a computerized method. It was concluded that comparable measurement results are possible between the traditional method and a computer-aided system (Chen et al., 2004a).

The present study did not test the reliability of computerized cephalometrics for a single landmark or a combination of landmarks. Most studies, however, have reported a difference in errors in the horizontal and vertical directions for single landmarks (Chen et al., 2000; Liu et al., 2000). The findings of the present investigation indicate that computerized cephalometric analysis yields comparable results to traditional cephalometric analysis.

Conclusions

The measurements obtained with the computerized cephalometric analysis programs used in the present study were shown to be reliable. Therefore computer-aided cephalometric analysis can be used by the clinician.
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